UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
V .	06 CR 150 (JSR) Sentence
JUSTIN GRAUER	
Defendant	
	New York, N.Y. October 6, 2015 4:20 p.m.
Before:	
HON. JED S	
	District Judge
APPEAR	ANCES
PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for Southern District of New You JANE KIM	
Assistant United States Att	orney
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP Attorney for Defendant Graue	er
ROBERT W. RAY	

(In open court; case called)

2

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Will the parties please identify themselves for the record.

3 4

MS. KIM: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jane Kim for the government.

5 6

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

7

8

MR. RAY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Robert W. Ray Fox Rothschild LLP on appointment of the Criminal Justice Act.

9

I am present here with my client, Justin Grauer.

10

THE COURT: Good afternoon. We are here for possible resentencing. The parties are agreed that the new offense

11 12

level would be 29. The Criminal History Category is IV. The

13

new guideline range would, therefore, be 151 to 188 months,

14

which, of course, would, if a quideline sentence were given, be

The government has opposed resentencing or reduction

15 a very substantial reduction.

it, so I won't.

16

17 because of Mr. Grauer's disciplinary history in prison, which

18

is somewhat extensive. And that is why I wanted Mr. Grauer

19 20

however, in any way, shape or form the incident of

21

February 2014 which was expunged; and although there is some

here to hear his own side of that story. I will not consider,

22

authority that says I could consider it, I don't think it is

23

really under the circumstances appropriate or fair to consider

24

25

Almost all the other incidents are basically fist

fights. And it seems clear that Mr. Grauer has a penchant forgetting into fist fights. He has kept his nose clean, so to speak, for the last few years in that regard, but it's not just one incident or two. It's several incidents. So I have some concerns about that. Of course, there are a lot of other factors that both sides have mentioned: The fact that the Court's original sentence was a considerable reduction from what the sentence might have been and so forth, but I will really focus today on whether Mr. Grauer's behavior in prison is sufficiently egregious as to preclude any significant reduction.

Let me hear first from defense counsel, then government counsel, then from Mr. Grauer if he wishes to be heard.

MR. RAY: Yes, your Honor. If I could just provide context about what I hope to be the exercise of the Court's discretion within that new range. I will say this: First, there is one other prior disciplinary issue that I did want to address before I get to the issue of fights and assaults. It is referenced by the government in its September 22 letter on the second page at the top. It is also contained within Exhibit D to that letter. This is the issue about possession of a narcotic or related paraphernalia not prescribed for the defendant by medical staff.

I think a review of the records will indicate, and my

client's own statements are consistent with that, and that is, that he was prescribed medication at a particular point in time which included these antianxiety and antidepressant medications. They were for the purpose of being consumed at the time they were prescribed. He retained them, so he's guilty of a disciplinary infraction by hanging on to medication that should have been consumed. He kept it in an Aleve bottle. But I did not want the Court to be left with the notion that what this was about was his attempt to smuggle in narcotics into the institution. They were prescribed to him.

THE COURT: Yes, the government may know more about this, but at least from the little I know, these two substances are not narcotics in the normal sense. These are essentially medications. Now some medications can have a narcotic effect, but this is not like heroin or cocaine or something of that nature.

MR. RAY: So not to make excuses, he does accept responsibility for the fact that what he did was unauthorized, but I didn't want the record to be left to wonder or your Honor to wonder whether or not this was truly a smuggling operation of some kind or if it was an effort to bring narcotics from outside of the institution into the institution. He was originally prescribed this medication, and in that sense what he did was hang on to it, which he shouldn't have done.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. RAY: Now, with regard, I think, to the principal issue that I think your Honor would like us to address, and that is the question of the fights and assaults in prison, I want to be careful here, but I do think there is some context that is useful; not to excuse a disciplinary report, which I think I would characterize as far from model. Understand, your Honor, this is somewhat of an unusual case. Where we're talking about Mr. Grauer who has served come February ten years of a 235 month sentence, so we're talking about a long period of time in a maximum security institution.

THE COURT: Yes, that is all true, but remember that in his original sentencing, even though the guideline range stipulated in his plea agreement was 188 to 235 months, probation had recommended no less than 360 months based on his very extensive criminal history, which is what put him up in Category VI. So, looked at from that angle, there was a neutral party, the probation office, recommending that he do 30 years.

MR. RAY: True. But I will say with regard to that — and I wasn't there; your Honor did the sentencing — I believe that what drove your Honor's query at sentencing as to why the government took a plea under the terms it did related to what amounted to essentially charge bargaining over quantity. I think that is what actually pushed it into a land that would otherwise, according to the probation office, have resulted in

an otherwise higher sentence.

I'm not here to argue about that. I wasn't there.

Your Honor made the decision that you made. There is no point in revisiting that, but I did want the record to reflect at least my understanding of why we landed in the range that we landed in when Mr. Grauer was originally sentenced.

Also, with regard to his prior criminal record at the time of the original sentencing, it does reflect a background and a penchant, as your Honor said, even at that point in his life with regard to assaults and fights. But my review of that record is that those were convictions under New York State law, all of which were misdemeanors.

With regard to his record, not to minimize it, while in the institution, I think your Honor has already noted that within at least the approximately last three years he has stayed out of trouble. The fights and assaults without getting into who started it -- and what I think my experience has shown not just the record in this case but in many other cases -- in maximum security institutions, there are measures that inmates take in a preemptive way to otherwise to protect themselves. It's not to excuse the conduct but it happens.

The second thing to say about it is that now I believe this record correctly reflects with regard to his disciplinary conduct the absence of any contraband in the institution, no weapons of any kind; and while it does reflect assaults and

fights, no one in that context was seriously injured. I don't mean to minimize it, but I just think that context is important. Mr. Grauer can speak to the specifics. I know your Honor, I'm sure, has questions, but I at least wanted that context to be presented here.

THE COURT: Very good. Let me hear from the government.

MS. KIM: Yes, your Honor. Two very brief points at the outset. In terms of the July 15, 2010 incident, the government agrees with defense counsel's recitation of the facts.

In terms of the February 12, 2014 incident and the government's September 22 submission, the government would just like to clarify that we came into possession of these reports after the last appearance, so we just wanted to make sure that the Court and defense counsel had all of that --

THE COURT: And it was very conscientious of you to provide that to me.

MS. KIM: Yes, thank you.

One other thing, the government just wanted to recognize that we believe the defendant's family is also in the courtroom. So we appreciate that they are here, and the government rests substantially on our submission, but we just want to make one main point and that is reiterated in our submission; that is, that from approximately 2004 to 2012 for

nearly a decade, regardless of whether or not the defendant was in prison or out of prison, the defendant committed approximately one violent or assaultive act each year. If the defendant had had perhaps one or two violent or assaultive incidents while in prison, we think that would have been a different story. But here the record reflects that he has 13 disciplinary incidents —

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Were any of those -certainly none in prison involved weapons. Were any of the
ones before prison involving weapons?

MS. KIM: I don't believe that they did involve weapons, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, I mean, in thinking about it -- and this is not to excuse it, but getting into fist fights and things of that sort seems to me of a different order. When you're using a weapon, you are either intending to or you, at least, run the very high risk of doing permanent damage to the other person. Now, that can happen in a fistfight, but it's much less likely. So I think there is something to the notion -- I'm not, if at all, though convinced by defense counsel's argument that this is necessarily a way of protecting himself.

I want to hear from Mr. Grauer, but it is more consistent with when angry, he resorts to his fists. We don't condone that. We don't excuse it. But it's not the same thing

as picking up a gun or a knife or something like that.

MS. KIM: Yes, your Honor, it's not the same thing as picking up a firearm, but we would say that it still arises to violent conduct and that the repeated instances are what concerns the government.

THE COURT: OK. Very good.

Let me hear from Mr. Grauer.

MR. RAY: Your Honor, I was just remiss, if I might say to your Honor and so the record reflects, my client's parents both of them are here, including the defendant's father Mr. Grauer, Ken Grauer who submitted a letter to I believe the probation office which I think your Honor has, and he suffers from ALS, but nevertheless made the trip into court at my request this afternoon.

THE COURT: Well, you know, I'm very delighted that these folks are here. I always have, to be frank, mixed reactions when a fine family like this is present. On the one hand is the fact that it shows so much positive about them in that they still love and want to be of assistance in any way possible to the defendant, and that is a lovely thing, and it reflects that there is good in him too or they wouldn't have those kinds of feelings.

On the other hand, they, of course, are among the victims of his crime because by committing crimes that led to his imprisonment, he took himself away from them in ways that

clearly have caused them anguish. So it is a mixed sword, but, in any event, I'm very happy they're here.

MR. RAY: The family members present include his grandparents, his uncle, his aunt, so a number of people.

Obviously, they are most aware of how long this has been, how long a sentence this is, and how much time he's already served but I just wanted to be sure your Honor was aware.

THE COURT: Mr. Grauer.

appreciate you allowing me the opportunity to come here and speak for myself and present some issues directly as a man to man. And in light of the infractions I caught while in BOP, I want to say I a hundred percent take full responsibility for every infraction I caught. And even though, you know, hindsight is 20/20, and looking back I feel like honestly I could have made better decisions and handled things in a much more mature way, much better, more educated way, I guess. But every day of my life is like a process of evolution, so I say this to say in the first part of my incarceration, I was still immature, and I was still going through a lot of growth and development. And, unfortunately, I didn't grow as fast as I should have grown, and I probably could have handled each situation differently.

THE COURT: Well, there must be situations now that you face where other inmates are either giving you a hard time

or threatening you or you have substantial disagreements with them where in the past you would fight them, why are you not doing that now?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, like I was saying, I've grown a lot in the last couple years. I've been through a lot of experiences where, you know, experience is the best teacher, so something I might have been more quick to fly off the handle with a couple years ago, I'm more passive. I look past it and say, you know, it's not worth it. I've learned through going through trials and tribulations. Not only that, but I'm trying to do the right thing. I'm taking things into consideration. I'm in a maximum security prison where not everybody around me wants to change. You know what I mean?

THE COURT: I understand that it's not populated entirely by Mother Teresas, yes.

THE DEFENDANT: So when you're an individual or a certain part of a group of individuals that do want to change, you're kind of looked at like you're ostracized because you're not one of the bad guys or at least you're not trying to be one of the bad guys any more. So when you're trying to change and the majority doesn't care about changing because they're never going home or they're not going home for 20, 30 years, you're kind of looked at as a Mr. Softy, so they try to take advantage of you or they try to push your buttons and see if they could get over on you because a lot of people prey on the weak, so

they see your lack of hostility as a weakness. So sometimes
I'm in certain situations where I have to stand up for myself
and defend myself so I'm not victimized in the future.

THE COURT: How are you handling that now?

THE DEFENDANT: So far, so good. The last three years I haven't had no physical disputes or anything.

THE COURT: I understand that, but there must have been -- I understand exactly the psychology you are talking about that some of the other inmates have, so you must still be being placed in situations where they're baiting you, where they're trying to get you to retaliate. And when you don't, what do they do then?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, my tolerance is -- I have a higher tolerance now. I just walk away or I, you know, I don't let words -- I used to let words bother me, words and, you know, of course, physical -- physical contact bothered me. I used to let more words bother me, and I would feed into it.

Now I turn the other cheek, so to speak. I let things role off my shoulder more now because I believe I'm getting older.

That's what I personally believe; I'm in the process of evolution.

THE COURT: How old are you now?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm 35. When I started, I was 25, 24.

THE COURT: Well, there's a lot of studies that suggest that actually people do change psychologically in the

way you indicate around the mid-thirties, so congratulations; you met the test.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: I was going to go through each of these incidents, but I think giving further thought to it, that would not necessarily be productive. It was very important to me though to hear from you personally, so I'm very happy you're here.

Is there anything else anyone wanted to raise for the Court at this time?

MS. KIM: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. RAY: Your Honor, I would ask in conclusion that you do exercise your discretion to sentence within the range. I have made the point that if it would be logical to conclude consistent with the way your Honor approached this from the original sentencing, that giving the defendant the benefit as he is eligible for — understanding that it's discretionary with the Court — to that reduced range, would put him in the new range, and that your Honor would sentence him to the top of that range just as you did in the original sentencing.

THE COURT: Mr. Grauer may not know this, but Mr. Ray is in my view one of the finest attorneys that practice in this court. I said this publicly on many occasions. One of the reasons is he doesn't ask for something absurd. He reads the judge's mind and he knows what is possible. And I thought,

2.2

Mr. Ray, this was a very good example. There is no way I would have considered giving him like the bottom of the range, but the top of the new range seems to me to be a reasonable request.

MR. RAY: Finally, I would just say, so your Honor knows context, because it took me a while to do the math, and even though it's somewhat difficult to figure out how much BOP gives for good time served and how in this particular instance given the disciplinary record — which may be wiser for me not to mention, but I need to mention it — it's not clear how much credit he'll get, but he will get some.

When I did the math, just so your Honor knows the math, he served, come February, ten years. If you figure if it were at the bottom of the range of 151 and you cranked into the equation what credit he would likely receive as a result of having now served that amount of time, 151 would actually probably put Mr. Grauer close to time served come the beginning or so of next year. What we're talking about, the remaining amount of time even at the higher end, it probably what amounts to a three year sentence or so remaining to be served. I wanted your Honor to understand kind of where we are now in October of 2015.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. RAY: That's it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thanks very much.

THE DEFENDANT: I appreciate that, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Grauer is, of course, saddled with his past. The past cannot be erased. The past is a very sad and disturbing one. Just from our discussions here and my recollection of the case earlier, it's clear that Mr. Grauer is an intelligent person who could have done a lot better for himself. But he is still a young man, and I think there is every indication that he is moving in a direction that warrants some consideration, so I am going to grant him the reduction to the top of the new guideline range.

So, the sentence of the Court is that he is sentenced to 188 months in prison to be followed by supervised release on the same terms and conditions as previously set. I can't remember whether those conditions included anger management as a special condition; but if not, we will add one now. So he will, upon his release, be given anger management help as the probation office determines it is appropriate.

Before I advise the defendant of his right to appeal, is there anything else either counsel wishes to raise with the Court anything from the government

MS. KIM: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything from the defense?

MR. RAY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Grauer, you have the right to appeal

```
this sentence. Do you understand that?
1
2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: If you can't afford counsel for any
      appeal, the Court will appoint one for you free of charge. Do
 4
5
      you understand that?
6
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Good luck to you.
8
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
9
               MS. KIM: Thank you, your Honor.
10
               (Adjourned)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```